

**2012 Groundwater NES/PPR QA/QC Checklist**  
**Virginia Department of Environmental Quality Division of Land Protection and Revitalization**

<b>NES Required Discussion</b>	<b>Discussed?</b>
Was at least one NES well installed downgradient of each exceeding well	
Was at least one NES well installed at the downgradient facility boundary	
Was the plume found to be contained within facility boundaries	
Were sufficient MWs installed to define vert/horz extent of GPS plume	
Were plume maps included in the submission	
If the plume was found off-site, were landowners notified & DEQ copied	
Was an evaluation of the current trends in groundwater quality with respect to GPS included	
Were the chemical aspects (nature) of the exceeding constituent(s) described	
<b>Additional Discussion Topics</b>	
Were all NES wells installed to RCRA standards	
Did the report contain the records of well installation	
Were all applicable constituents sampled for in all NES wells	
Were NES GW elevations obtained to define rate and direction of plume movement	
Were constituent-specific groundwater plume maps included	
Was a vertical plume concentration map included	
Was a horizontal plume concentration map included	
<b>PPR Required Discussion</b>	
Does the site monitor GW in the Subtitle D equivalent program under 250.b?	
Does the site display GW contamination beyond facility boundaries	
<b>Risk Assessment Required Discussion</b>	
Was assessment of risk from exposure to contamination at the facility boundary included	
Was assessment of risk from exposure to contamination at the disposal unit boundary compliance points included	
<b>Remedy Selection Required Discussion</b>	<b>NA if not applicable</b>
Reasons why use of an impermeable cap discussed	
Reasons why use of landfill leachate control discussed	
Reasons why use of control of groundwater migration discussed	
Reasons why use of collection and treatment of LFG discussed	
Reasons why use of reduction of saturation of waste mass discussed	
If the plume extends offsite, was the selected presumptive remedy aspect shown to be able to address this contamination	

Public Participation Required Discussion		Discussed?
Was a public meeting held prior to submission of the presumptive remedy		
Was notice of the public meeting run in a local newspaper twice		
Did the notice content meet Regulatory requirements		
Was the draft PPR placed in a location accessible to the public		
Was the public meeting held in accordance with the VSWMR timeframes		
Timeframe Required Discussion		
Anticipated schedule to initiate Presumptive Remedy		
Anticipated schedule to complete remedial activities		
Schedule for evaluating the performance of the remedy		
Proposed content of performance evaluation meets VSWMR requirements		